arXiv:1601.04790v1 [math-ph] 19 Jan 2016

Corrigendum: The dependence on the monodromy data of the isomonodromic tau function

M. Bertola[†,‡♯][1][2]

[†] *Department of Mathematics and Statistics, Concordia University*
1455 de Maisonneuve W., Montréal, Québec, Canada H3G 1M8
[‡] *SISSA/ISAS, via Bonomea 265, 34135, Trieste, Italy*
[♯] *Centre de recherches mathématiques, Université de Montréal*

Abstract.

The note corrects the aforementioned paper [1]. The consequences of the correction are traced and the examples updated.

1 Introduction

With this note I wish to correct two mistakes of loc. cit.; one of them (and its consequences) is of trivial nature and it is quickly disposed of. The second is significant, but not fatal, and requires rather extensive additional material, which is the reason of the relatively large size of this erratum.

Before entering into the detail I wish to extend my apology to the mathematical community. In partial defence it was not an entirely obvious mistake, as, I hope, will transpire.

I also wish to heartedly thank Oleg Lisovyy for pointing out certain inconsistencies that convinced me that indeed there was a mistake in need of fixing.

The omission only affects certain types of setup; if the contours of the RHP are without intersection, then the result is correct as it stands. In the subsequent works of my collaborators and myself only this type of problems were actually considered; therefore the following papers are essentially unaffected (although any reporting of the original formula is not correct in the stated generality): [6, 5, 3, 4, 2].

2 Minimal setup

The original setup requires to consider a Riemann Hilbert Problem (RHP) with the following data

The Riemann–Hilbert data

1. a finite collection of smooth oriented arcs $\gamma_\nu,\ j = 1 \dots K$, possibly meeting at a finite number of points but always in non-tangential way. We denote collectively these arcs by the symbol $\Sigma\gamma = \bigcup \gamma_\nu$. If any of the contours γ_ν extends to infinity then we shall assume that the contour has an asymptotic direction and that the corresponding jump matrix $M_\nu(z)$ tends to the identity faster than any power $M_\nu(z) = \mathbf{1} + \mathcal{O}(z^{-\infty}),\ z \to \infty$, with this decay valid in an open sector of nonzero angle around the direction of approach.

[1]Work supported in part by the Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada (NSERC).
[2]Marco.Bertola@{concordia.ca, sissa.it}.

2. a collection of $r \times r$ matrices $M_\nu(z)$, each of which analytic at each interior point of its corresponding arc γ_ν. We will denote collectively by $M(z)$ the matrix defined on $\Sigma\gamma$ that coincides with $M_\nu(z)$ on γ_ν,

$$\begin{aligned} M : \Sigma\gamma &\to SL_r(\mathbb{C}) \\ z &\mapsto \sum_\nu M_\nu(z)\chi_{\gamma_\nu}(z) \end{aligned} \tag{2.1}$$

where, for a set S, χ_S denotes its indicator function.

3. At each point c where several arcs meet, denoting by $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_\ell$ the arcs entering a suitably small disk at c, we impose that the jump matrices along its corresponding arc either
   - they tend to the identity matrix as $\mathcal{O}((z-c)^\infty)$ (faster than any power) in an open sector containing the direction of approach (this applies also to any jump matrix on contours extending to infinity, where $(z-c)$ is replaced by $1/z$). Or
   - they admit local analytic extension within said disk. Furthermore, if we denote by $\gamma_1, \dots, \gamma_n$ the contours incident at c, oriented outwards, and labelled counterclockwise, and $M_\ell(z) = M(z)\Big|_{z\in\gamma_\ell}$, then the analytic extension satisfies

     $$M_1(z) \cdot M_2(z) \cdots M_n(z) \equiv \mathbf{1}, \tag{2.2}$$

     and this (locally) identically also with respect to the deformation parameters.

Problem 2.1 (RHP) *Find a holomorphic matrix $\Gamma : \mathbb{C} \setminus \Sigma\gamma \to GL_n(\mathbb{C})$ such that*

- $\Gamma_+(z) = \Gamma_-(z)M(z)$ $z \in \Sigma\gamma$;
- $\Gamma(z)$ *is uniformly bounded in* $\mathbb{C}$;
- $\Gamma(z_0) = \mathbf{1}$

Assuming that the solution exists for given initial data, [1] considered the *deformations* of the jump matrices (respecting the conditions listed above).

2.1 Corrections

The overall minus sign in (2.7) of Def. 2.1 [1] should be removed. While this is a definition, the purpose was to extend the Jimbo-Miwa-Ueno definition, and the correct sign should have been the opposite one. For convenience, here is the corrected definition. Of course the sign should be changed also in the subsequent formulæ, but it is otherwise an entirely harmless snafu.

Definition 2.1 (Def 2.1 in [1]) *Let ∂ denote the derivative w.r.t. one of the parameters s and assume that the Riemann–Hilbert Problem 2.1 admits a solution in an open subset of the deformation–parameter space.*[3] *Then we define Malgrange's form $\omega_{_M}$*

$$\omega_{_M}(\partial) = \omega_{_M}(\partial; [\Gamma]) := \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma'_-(z)\Xi_\partial(z)\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \qquad \Xi_\partial(z) := \partial M(z) M^{-1}(z)\ . \tag{2.3}$$

[3] The small–norm theorem for Riemann–Hilbert problems implies that if a RHP is solvable, then any sufficiently small deformation (in L^2 and L^∞ norms) of the jump matrices leads to a solvable RHP. With our assumptions on the s–dependence of the jump matrices this implies that the subset of solvable RHP is an open set (if non-empty).

New notation In order to deal more expeditiously with the correction we shall also use matrix-valued forms (Maurer-Cartan like) $\Xi(z) := \delta M(z) M^{-1}(z)$, where δ shall denote henceforth the exterior derivative with respect to the deformation parameters $\vec{t}$ (not to confuse it with the $\mathrm{d}z$ of the spectral variable). We shall also retain the notation Ξ_∂ for the contraction of said form with a vector field ∂.

Proposition 2.1 in [1] offers an incomplete formula for the exterior derivative of $\omega_{_M}$ and we correct it now. The additional term in the following Theorem is present only when there are points of $\Sigma\gamma$ with several incident arcs; we call this the "set of vertices" of $\Sigma\gamma$ and denote it by $\mathfrak{V}$. For example if $\Sigma\gamma$ consists in the union of smooth disjoint arcs, or the jump matrices tend to the identity at all the vertices, then the original statement stands correct.

Theorem 2.1 (Replaces Prop. 2.1 of [1]) *Denote by $\mathfrak{V} \ni v$ the vertices of the graph $\Sigma\gamma$; let $\mathcal{E}_v = \bigcup_{j=1}^{n_v} \gamma_j^{(v)}$ be the set of arcs incident to v, oriented outwards and enumerated counterclockwise. Then exterior derivative of $\omega_{_M}(\partial)$ is*

$$\delta\omega_{_M} = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}z}\Xi(z) \wedge \Xi(w) \right)\Big|_{w=z} + \eta_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{2.4}$$

with

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{V}} := \frac{-1}{4i\pi} \sum_{v\in\mathfrak{V}} \sum_{\ell=2}^{n_v} \sum_{m=1}^{\ell-1} \mathrm{Tr}\left(M^{(v)}_{[1:m-1]} \Xi^{(v)}_m M^{(v)}_{[m:\ell-1]} \wedge \Xi^{(v)}_\ell M^{(v)}_{[\ell:n]} \right) \tag{2.5}$$

with

$$\Xi^{(v)}_\ell = \lim_{z\to v} \delta M^{(v)}_\ell (M^{(v)}_\ell)^{-1}\Big|_{z\in\gamma^{(v)}_\ell} \qquad M^{(v)}_\ell = \lim_{\substack{z\to v \\ z\in\gamma^{(v)}_\ell}} M^{\epsilon_\ell}(z). \tag{2.6}$$

where the power $\epsilon_\ell = 1$ if the contour $\gamma^{(v)}_\ell$ is oriented away from v and $\sharp\gamma_\ell = -1$ if oriented towards.

The complete proof is reported in Appendix A. The "modified Malgrange form" Ω (Def. 2.2 in [1]) is (with the corrected sign)

Definition 2.2 *The modified Malgrange differential is defined as $\Omega := \omega_{_M} + \vartheta$ with*

$$\vartheta(\partial) := \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma\gamma} \mathrm{Tr}\left(M'(z) M^{-1}(z) \partial M(z) M^{-1}(z) \right) \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \tag{2.7}$$

Equivalently (see (2.32) in [1])

$$\Omega(\partial;[\Gamma]) = \frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma\gamma} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma'_-(z) \partial M(z) M^{-1}(z) + \Gamma_+^{-1}(z)\Gamma'_+(z) M^{-1}(z) \partial M(z) \right) \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \tag{2.8}$$

Consequent to the correction of Prop. 2.1, the ancillary result below (Prop. 2.2 in [1]) is also similarly modified

Proposition 2.1 *The curvature of the modified Malgrange form is*

$$\delta\Omega = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma\gamma} \mathrm{Tr}\left(M'(z) M^{-1}(z) \Xi(z) \wedge \Xi(z) \right) \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} + \eta_{\mathfrak{V}} \tag{2.9}$$

2.2 Rational differential equations (amended)

In the setup of Sec. 2.2, the term $\eta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is closed and admits a potential $\theta_{\mathfrak{V}}$; consequently in Sec. 2.2 of [1] the title should read: "Submanifolds of $\mathcal{G}$ where $\delta\Omega - \eta_{\mathfrak{V}} = 0$". Sections 2.3, 2.4 are unaffected.

The main application of the original paper was to Riemann–Hilbert problems related to the setting of [9], i.e. the generalized monodromy data associated to a (generic) rational connection on $\mathbb{CP}^1$.

The statement that Ω is a closed one-form is incorrect in the stated generality and needs to be corrected.

To explain the necessary modifications we keep the same setup of Sections 3,4,5 (and Fig. 5, 6 of [1]).

Theorem 2.2 (Replaces Thm. 5.1 in [1]) *There exists a local one form $\theta_{\mathfrak{V}} = \theta_{\mathfrak{V}}(\vec{L}, \vec{S}, \vec{C})$ on the manifold of generalized monodromy data (independent of the Birkhoff invariants and the position of the poles) such that the Jimbo-Miwa-Ueno tau function satisfies*

$$\delta \ln \tau(\vec{T}, \vec{a}, \vec{L}, \vec{S}, \vec{C}) = \omega_{_M} - \theta_{\mathfrak{V}}\,, \tag{2.10}$$

where $\delta\theta_{\mathfrak{V}} = \eta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ in (2.5). This function is defined up to nonzero multiplicative constant and it vanishes precisely when the Riemann–Hilbert problem is not solvable, namely, on the Malgrange Theta-divisor.

Remark 2.1 *Note that the theorem is now stated directly in terms of $\omega_{_M}$ rather than the "modified" form Ω used in the original paper. The two forms differ by an explicit one form so there is little simplification in choosing one over the other, since none is closed by itself in the relevant case.*

Remark 2.2 *Since $\theta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ is only locally defined on the monodromy manifold, the formula (2.10) allows to identify τ as a section of a line bundle on said manifold. The transition functions are given by $\delta g = \widetilde{\theta_{\mathfrak{V}}} - \theta_{\mathfrak{V}}$ on the overlap of two open charts. This observation, which stems from the correction term in Thm. 2.1 seems to be of interest in applications that are arising from recent works [8] and deserves further study.*

Rather than chasing a complete generality we illustrate the statement in several significant cases.

2.3 Example 0: Scalar Fuchsian case



Figure 1: The arrangement of disks for the scalar case.

Consider the scalar RHP (see Fig. 1)

$$\Gamma(z) = \begin{cases} \prod_{j=1}^n (z-a_j)^{\theta_j} & \mathbb{C} \setminus \bigcup \mathbb{D}_j \\ \prod_{j=1, j\neq k}^n (z-a_j)^{\theta_j} & z \in \mathbb{D}_k \end{cases}, \qquad \sum \theta_j = 0. \tag{2.11}$$

$$\Gamma_-^{-1}\Gamma_+ = \begin{cases} (z-a_k)^{-\theta_k} & z \in \gamma_k = \partial\mathbb{D}_k \\ \mathrm{e}^{-2i\pi\theta_k} & z \in \gamma_k^0 \end{cases} \tag{2.12}$$

where γ_k^0 is a contour $[\beta_k, z_0]$, with β_k chosen and fixed on γ_k and z_0 a fixed basepoint outside, chosen in such a way that no two points a_j are not on the same ray from z_0. The Malgrange one-form is

$$\begin{aligned}
\omega_{\scriptscriptstyle M} &= \int \Gamma_-^{-1}\Gamma'_-\delta M M^{-1}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} = \qquad (2.13)\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \int \frac{\theta_j}{z-a_j}\sum_k \left(\left(\frac{\theta_k\,\mathrm{d}a_k}{z-a_k} - \ln(z-a_k)\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\right)\chi_{\partial\mathbb{D}_k} - 2i\pi\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\chi_{\gamma_k^0}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} = \text{(contour deformation)}\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{k\neq j}\left(\frac{\theta_j\theta_k\,\mathrm{d}a_k}{a_k-a_j} - \theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\int_{a_k}^{z_0}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{z-a_j}\right) - \frac{1}{4i\pi}\theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_j \ln^2(z-a_j)\Big|_{\beta_j}^{\beta_j+\gamma_j} - \theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_j\int_{\beta_j}^{z_0}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{(z-a_j)}\right]\\
&= \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{k\neq j}\left(\frac{\theta_j\theta_k\,\mathrm{d}a_k}{a_k-a_j} - \theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\big(\ln(z_0-a_j) - \ln(a_k-a_j)\big)\right) + \right.\\
&\qquad \left. -\frac{1}{4i\pi}\theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_j(4i\pi\ln(\beta_j-a_j) + (2i\pi)^2) - \theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_j(\ln(z_0-a_j) - \ln(\beta_j-a_j))\right]
\end{aligned}$$

Here all logarithms are principal; the term involving z_0 drop out because $\sum \mathrm{d}\theta_k = 0$, as well as the dependence on β_j. We are left with

$$\omega_{\scriptscriptstyle M} = \sum_{j=1}^n \left[\sum_{k\neq j}\left(\frac{\theta_j\theta_k\,\mathrm{d}a_k}{a_k-a_j} + \theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\ln(a_k-a_j)\right) - i\pi\theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_j\right] \qquad (2.14)$$

Here the logarithms are all principal. The exterior derivative of the above expression is

$$\delta\omega_{\scriptscriptstyle M} = \eta_{\mathfrak{B}} = \sum_j\sum_{k\neq j}\mathrm{d}\theta_j\wedge\mathrm{d}\theta_k(\ln(a_k-a_j) - \ln(a_j-a_k)) = i\pi\sum_j\sum_{k<j}\mathrm{d}\theta_j\wedge\mathrm{d}\theta_k = i\pi\,\mathrm{d}\left(\sum_j\sum_{k<j}\theta_j\,\mathrm{d}\theta_k\right) \qquad (2.15)$$

In this case the Tau function is explicit

$$\delta\ln\tau = \omega_{\scriptscriptstyle M} + \sum_{k<\ell}\theta_k\,\mathrm{d}\theta_\ell\ , \quad \tau(\vec{a},\vec{\theta}) = \prod_{\ell=1}^n\prod_{k<\ell}(a_k-a_\ell)^{\theta_k\theta_\ell}\prod_{k=1}^n \mathrm{e}^{-\frac{i\pi}{2}\theta_k^2} \qquad (2.16)$$

To be noted, there is an ambiguity in the above writing because of the determinations of the logarithm; the ambiguity is what defines the line bundle of which τ is a section.

2.4 Fuchsian singularities with nontrivial monodromy (e.g. Painlevé VI)

Suppose that the RHP corresponds to the solution of a generic Fuchsian ODE with simple poles at $a_1,\dots,a_K$ of the form

$$\Psi'(z) = \sum_{j=1}^K \frac{A_j}{z-a_j}\Psi(z)\ , \quad A_j = O_jL_jO_j^{-1}, \quad L_j = \text{ diagonal}\ . \qquad (2.17)$$

We set $\Lambda_j = \mathrm{e}^{2i\pi L_j}$ (diagonal) and the monodromy matrices are $\mathcal{M}_j := C_j^{-1}\Lambda_jC_j$. The enumeration is counterclockwise from the basepoint z_0 as indicated in Fig. 2. We have the condition

$$\mathcal{M}_1\cdots\mathcal{M}_K = \mathbf{1} \qquad (2.18)$$



Figure 2: The arrangement of jumps for a generic Fuchsian system.

Then a direct computation using Thm. 2.1 yields

$$\delta\omega_{_M} = \eta_{\mathfrak{w}} = \frac{-1}{4i\pi}\left(\sum_{\ell=2}^{K}\sum_{1\le k<\ell}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\mathcal{M}_{[1:\ell-1]}\delta\mathcal{M}_\ell\mathcal{M}_{[\ell+1:k-1]}\wedge\delta\mathcal{M}_k\mathcal{M}_{[k+1:K]}\Big)+\right.$$
$$\left.+\sum_{\ell=1}^{K}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Lambda_\ell\delta C_\ell C_\ell^{-1}\wedge\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\delta C_\ell C_\ell^{-1}+2\Lambda_\ell^{-1}\delta\Lambda_\ell\wedge\delta C_\ell C_\ell^{-1}\Big)\right) \tag{2.19}$$
$$\mathcal{M}_j := C_j^{-1}\Lambda_j C_j\ ,\quad \Lambda_j := e^{2i\pi L_j},\quad \mathcal{M}_{[j:k]} := \mathcal{M}_j\cdot\mathcal{M}_{j+1}\cdots\mathcal{M}_k. \tag{2.20}$$

As announced in Thm. 2.2, $\delta\omega_{_M}$ is *independent of the poles' positions*. It is a closed two-form on the character variety (2.18) itself. It is not immediate to verify directly from the formula that the two–form $\eta_{\mathfrak{w}}$ in (2.19) is actually closed, but it is a consequence of the Theorem (2.1)[4].

On the other hand, since it is a closed two-form on the character variety (2.18), it follows that there is a locally defined one-form on the character variety, which we shall denote $\theta_{\mathfrak{w}}$, such that $\delta\theta_{\mathfrak{w}} = \eta_{\mathfrak{w}}$.

Example 2.1 *The simplest example of Painlevé VI requires to describe explicitly the one-form* $\theta_{\mathfrak{w}}$.

We shall assume that the monodromies $\mathcal{M}_{1,..4}$ *are non-resonant (i.e. the eigenvalues of* L_j *do not differ by integers). This, however, proves to be too complicated to handle explicitly in complete generality, so we consider, by the way of example, the following particular submanifold of (2.18);*

$$C_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s_1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} C_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ s_2 & 1 \end{bmatrix} C_3 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s_3 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} C_4 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ s_4 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.21}$$

We set $\Lambda_j = \mathrm{diag}(\lambda_j, \lambda_j^{-1})$*; then we can solve the condition (2.18) for* λ_4, s_2, s_4 *on a suitable open subset of the above submanifold of the character variety*

$$\left\{\ \lambda_4 = -\frac{s_3\lambda_1\lambda_2\left(\lambda_3^2-1\right)}{\lambda_3 s_1\left(\lambda_1^2-1\right)}, s_2 = \frac{s_3{\lambda_1}^2{\lambda_2}^2{\lambda_3}^2 - s_3{\lambda_1}^2{\lambda_2}^2 + {\lambda_1}^2 s_1 - s_1}{s_3 s_1\left(\lambda_3^2-1\right)\left(\lambda_2^2-1\right)\left(\lambda_1^2-1\right)}, \right. \tag{2.22}$$
$$\left. s_4 = -\frac{\left(s_3{\lambda_1}^2{\lambda_2}^2{\lambda_3}^2 - s_3{\lambda_1}^2{\lambda_2}^2 + {\lambda_1}^2 s_1 - s_1\right)\lambda_3{}^2}{\left({\lambda_1}^2\lambda_3 s_1 - \lambda_3 s_1 + s_3\lambda_1\lambda_2 - s_3\lambda_1\lambda_2{\lambda_3}^2\right)\left({\lambda_1}^2\lambda_3 s_1 - \lambda_3 s_1 + s_3\lambda_1\lambda_2{\lambda_3}^2 - s_3\lambda_1\lambda_2\right)}\right\} \tag{2.23}$$

[4]The verification that the expression (2.19) is indeed closed on the manifold (2.18) was performed directly with the aid of a computer in small cases; a direct proof would be desirable.



Figure 3: The contours of the RHP within a "toral circle" (in the terminology of [1]). In the figure, $M_\nu = (z-a)^L e^{T(z)} S_\nu e^{-T(z)} (z-a)^{-L}$, the cut of the function $(z-a)^L$ is along the blue contour, $T(z)$ is of the form $T(z) = \sum_{j=1}^{r+1} T_j (z-a)^{-j} + T_0$ and T_0 is a constant diagonal matrix chosen so that $(\rho - a)^L e^{T(\rho)} = \mathbf{1}$, where ρ is the point on the boundary of the toral circle where the various Stokes' contours meet.

so that the character variety is now locally coordinatized by the coordinates $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, s_1, s_3$. Then the two form $\eta_{\mathfrak{w}}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}\eta_{\mathfrak{w}} = &\frac{({\lambda_1}^2+1)d\lambda_1\wedge d\lambda_2}{2i\pi\lambda_2\left({\lambda_1}^2-1\right)\lambda_1} + \frac{({\lambda_1}^2{\lambda_3}^2+{\lambda_3}^2+{\lambda_1}^2+1)d\lambda_1\wedge d\lambda_3}{2i\pi\left({\lambda_3}^2-1\right)\lambda_3\lambda_1\left({\lambda_1}^2-1\right)} - \frac{d\lambda_1\wedge ds_1}{2i\pi\lambda_1 s_1} + \frac{({\lambda_1}^2+1)d\lambda_1\wedge ds_3}{2i\pi\lambda_1 s_3\left({\lambda_1}^2-1\right)} + \\ &-\frac{({\lambda_3}^2+1)d\lambda_2\wedge d\lambda_3}{2i\pi\lambda_2\lambda_3\left({\lambda_3}^2-1\right)} - \frac{d\lambda_2\wedge ds_1}{2i\pi s_1\lambda_2} - \frac{d\lambda_2\wedge ds_3}{2i\pi s_3\lambda_2} - \frac{({\lambda_3}^2+1)d\lambda_3\wedge ds_1}{2i\pi s_1\left({\lambda_3}^2-1\right)\lambda_3} - \frac{d\lambda_3\wedge ds_3}{2i\pi s_3\lambda_3} + \frac{ds_1\wedge ds_3}{2i\pi s_1 s_3}\end{aligned} \tag{2.24}$$

and then a direct computation using the DeRham homotopy operator (after checking that the form above is indeed closed), we obtain

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{w}} = \frac{\left({\lambda_3}^2\ln(s_1 s_3) + \ln\left(\frac{s_1}{s_3}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda_3}{2i\pi\lambda_3\left({\lambda_3}^2-1\right)} - \frac{\ln(s_3)\,\mathrm{d}s_1}{2i\pi s_1} + \frac{\left(\ln\left(\frac{s_3 s_1(\lambda_3^2-1)}{\lambda_3}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda_2}{2i\pi\lambda_2} - \frac{\left({\lambda_1}^2\ln\left(\frac{s_3(\lambda_3^2-1)\lambda_2}{s_1\lambda_3}\right) + \ln\left(\frac{s_3 s_1\lambda_2(\lambda_3^2-1)}{\lambda_3}\right)\right)\mathrm{d}\lambda_1}{2i\pi\left({\lambda_1}^2-1\right)\lambda_1}$$

2.5 Higher Poincaré rank singularities: the case of Painlevé II

If the system has also poles of higher order (under the same original genericity assumption that the leading coefficient matrix of the singular part of the connection is semi-simple), then the corresponding RHP has additional contours of jumps to account for the Stokes' phenomenon. In view of the correction in Thm. 2.1 we slightly modify their definition within the "toral circle" (Fig. 5 in [1]) as in Fig. 3. Supposing that $S_1, \dots S_{2r}$ are the Stokes' matrices and L the diagonal matrix of the exponents of formal monodromy at a given singularity of higher Poincaré rank, they must satisfy

$$S_1 \cdots S_{2r} e^{2i\pi L} = \mathbf{1} \tag{2.25}$$

and there is a contribution to $\eta_{\mathfrak{w}}$ in the form (we denote $S_{2r+1} = e^{2i\pi L}$)

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{w}} = \frac{-1}{4i\pi}\sum_{\ell=1}^{2r+1}\sum_{1\le k<\ell}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(S_{[1:k-1]}\delta S_k S_{[k+1;\ell-1]}\wedge\delta S_\ell S_{[\ell+1:2r+1]}\Big) \tag{2.26}$$

which is a closed two–form on the manifold (2.25). This type of contributions comes one for each higher Poincaré rank singularity. As an illustration, the example of Painevé II is instructive. We follow the general formulation of ([10], App.C); in this case we have six rays along $\varpi_\ell = e^{(\ell-1)i\pi/3}\mathbb{R}_+$ and $\varpi_7 = e^{-i\pi/6}\mathbb{R}_+$ with jumps

$$M_{1,3,5} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & s_{1,3,5} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_{2,4,6} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ s_{2,4,6} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_7 = \begin{bmatrix} \lambda & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \tag{2.27}$$

subject to the condition (2.2). We can solve for s_2, s_4, s_6 in terms of the remaining variables in the subset $\{s_1 s_3 s_5 \lambda \neq 0\}$ to give

$$\left\{ s_2 = -\frac{s_5 + s_3\lambda + \lambda\, s_1}{s_3 \lambda\, s_1}, s_4 = -\frac{\lambda\, s_1 + s_5 + s_3}{s_3 s_5}, s_6 = -\frac{s_5 + s_3\lambda + s_1\lambda^2}{s_1\lambda^2 s_5} \right\} \tag{2.28}$$

Then $\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ becomes

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}s_1 \wedge \mathrm{d}\lambda}{2i\pi s_1 \lambda} - \frac{\mathrm{d}s_3 \wedge \mathrm{d}\lambda}{2i\pi \lambda\, s_3} + \frac{\mathrm{d}s_5 \wedge \mathrm{d}\lambda}{2i\pi \lambda\, s_5} - \frac{\mathrm{d}s_3 \wedge \mathrm{d}s_1}{2i\pi s_3 s_1} + \frac{\mathrm{d}s_5 \wedge \mathrm{d}s_1}{2i\pi s_1 s_5} - \frac{\mathrm{d}s_5 \wedge \mathrm{d}s_3}{2i\pi s_3 s_5} \tag{2.29}$$

Note that $\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ defines a *symplectic form* on the Stokes' manifold, whereby all coordinates λ, s_1, s_3, s_5 are log-canonical and the form $\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}}$ is

$$\theta_{\mathfrak{Y}} = \ln\left(\frac{s_5 s_1}{s_3}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}\lambda}{4i\pi\lambda} - \ln\left(\frac{s_3\lambda}{s_5}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}s_1}{4i\pi s_1} + \ln\left(\frac{s_1\lambda}{s_5}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}s_3}{4i\pi s_3} - \ln\left(\frac{s_1\lambda}{s_3}\right)\frac{\mathrm{d}s_5}{4i\pi s_5} \tag{2.30}$$

The special case of PII as reported in [1] consists in

$$\left\{ \lambda = 1, s_1 = s_1, s_2 = -\frac{s_3 + s_1}{s_1 s_3 + 1}, s_3 = s_3, s_4 = s_1, s_5 = -\frac{s_3 + s_1}{s_1 s_3 + 1}, s_6 = s_3 \right\} \tag{2.31}$$

$$\eta_{\mathfrak{Y}} = \frac{\mathrm{d}s_1 \wedge \mathrm{d}s_3}{i\pi(s_1 s_3 + 1)}\,, \qquad \theta_{\mathfrak{Y}} = \frac{\ln(s_1 s_3 + 1)}{2i\pi}\left(\frac{\mathrm{d}s_3}{s_3} - \frac{\mathrm{d}s_1}{s_1}\right) \tag{2.32}$$

A Proof of Thm. 2.1

Lemma A.1 *Let γ be an oriented smooth arc without self-intersection and let $\varphi : \gamma \times \gamma \to \mathbb{C}$ be a function which is locally analytic in each variable and such that $\varphi(z,w) = -\varphi(w,z)$. Then*

$$\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(w - z_-)^2} = -\frac{1}{2}\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \partial_w \varphi(w,z)\Big|_{w=z}\,. \tag{1.1}$$

Proof. It is shown in Section 7 of [7] that if $A(w,z)$ is Hölder (jointly) for $z, w \in \gamma$, then

$$\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{A(w,z)}{(w-z)} = \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \frac{A(w,z)}{(w-z)}. \tag{1.2}$$

where $\fint$ denotes the Cauchy's principal value integral. We will use Sokhotski-Plemelj's formula

$$\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\Phi(w)}{w - z_\pm} = \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\Phi(w)}{w - z} \pm \frac{1}{2}\Phi(z)\,, \quad z \in \gamma. \tag{1.3}$$

Since $\varphi(w,z)$ is (locally) jointly analytic in z, w, we can use Gakhov's result (1.2) with $A(w,z) := \frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(w-z)}$, which is now also a jointly analytic function of its variables in a neighbourhood of γ. Note that $A(z,z) = \partial_w \varphi(w,z)|_{w=z}$ is well defined and $A(z,w) = A(w,z)$. Now

$$\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2}\right) \overset{(1.3)}{=} \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{A(w,z)}{(w-z)} - \frac{1}{2}\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \partial_w \varphi(w,z)\Big|_{w=z}\,. \tag{1.4}$$

We now show that the principal value integral is zero; to this end we use $A(z,w) = A(w,z)$, which holds for our case. Then

$$\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{A(w,z)}{(w-z)} = \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{A(z,w)}{(w-z)} \overset{(1.2)}{=} \int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \frac{A(z,w)}{(w-z)} \overset{z \leftrightarrow w}{=} -\int_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \fint_\gamma \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{A(w,z)}{(w-z)} \tag{1.5}$$

Thus the contribution of the principal value integral in (1.4) is zero. ■

Proof of Thm. 2.1 We shall denote by $\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon = \Sigma\gamma \setminus \bigcup_{v\in\mathfrak{V}} \mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{(v)} =: \Sigma\gamma \setminus \mathbb{D}_\epsilon$ the support of the jumps minus small ϵ–disks around the point of self-intersection of $\Sigma\gamma$; we use the notation

$$\varphi(w,z) := \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_-(w)\Xi(w)\Gamma_-^{-1}(w) \wedge \Gamma_-(z)\Xi(z)\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Big) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \varphi(z,w) = -\varphi(w,z). \tag{1.6}$$

Lemma 2.1 in [1] yields the formula (in the new notation)

$$\delta\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\right) = \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-(w)\Xi(w)\Gamma_-^{-1}(w)\Gamma_-(z)}{(z_- - w)^2} \tag{1.7}$$

whence we compute the exterior derivative as follows

$$\delta\omega_{_M} = \delta \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\Xi(z)\right) = \delta \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\Xi(z)\right) = \tag{1.8}$$

$$= \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\frac{\Gamma^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-(w)\Xi(w)\Gamma_-^{-1}(w) \wedge \Gamma_-(z)\Xi(z)}{(z_- - w)^2}\right) + \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\delta\Xi(z)\right) \tag{1.9}$$

Note that $\Xi = \delta M M^{-1}$ satisfies $\delta\Xi = \Xi \wedge \Xi$ (i.e. $\delta\Xi\lfloor_{\partial,\widetilde{\partial}} = \partial\Xi_{\widetilde{\partial}} - \widetilde{\partial}\Xi_\partial = [\Xi_\partial, \Xi_{\widetilde{\partial}}]$) and hence (using the cyclicity of the trace)

$$\delta\omega_{_M} = \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2} + \int_{\Sigma\gamma} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\Xi(z) \wedge \Xi(z)\right) \tag{1.10}$$

The issue is the computation of the iterated integral; as an iterated integral it is convergent but its value depends on the order of integration. To see why it is convergent, we need to make sure that the inner integral does not have too severe singularities; these may occur at the intersection points of the arcs because the derivative of the Cauchy transform may have poles. To show that this does not happen we consider one such intersection point $v \in \mathfrak{V}$ and enumerate the incident arcs $\gamma_1, \ldots, \gamma_n$ (in counterclockwise order) and define

$$\Gamma_j(z) := \Gamma_-(z)\Big|_{z\in\gamma_j}, \quad \varphi_{kj}(w,z) = \varphi(w,z)\Big|_{\substack{z\in\gamma_j \\ w\in\gamma_k}} \quad etc. \tag{1.11}$$

Without loss of generality we can assume that all arcs γ_j are oriented away from v. If a ray is incident, then this requires us to locally re-define $\Gamma_j \mapsto \Gamma_j M_j$, $M_j \mapsto M_j^{-1}$ and reverse the orientation in the integral, thanks to the obvious formula

$$\Gamma_k \partial M_k M_k^{-1} \Gamma_k^{-1} = -(\Gamma_k M_k)\partial(M_k^{-1})M_k(\Gamma_k M_k)^{-1} \tag{1.12}$$

(note that $\Gamma_- M = \Gamma_+$ becomes the $-$ boundary value in the reversed orientation).

Under Assumption (2.2), we can locally express the analytic extensions of each $\Gamma_j(z)$ in terms of the analytic extension of $\Gamma_1(z)$ to a full neighbourhood of $v \in \mathfrak{V}$;

$$\Gamma_k(z) = \Gamma_\ell(z) M_{[\ell:k-1]}(z) = \Gamma_1(z) M_{[1:k-1]}(z)\ , \quad \ell < k. \tag{1.13}$$

where $M_{[a:b]}(z) = M_a(z)M_{a+1}(z)\cdots M_b(z)$. Taking the differential δ of the local condition (2.2) we find (evaluation being understood at $z = v$)

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n} M_{[1:j-1]}\Xi_j M_{[j:n]} = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma_1^{-1}\Gamma_j\Xi_j\Gamma_j^{-1}\Gamma_1 \equiv 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \sum_{j=1}^{n} \Gamma_j\Xi_j\Gamma_j^{-1} \equiv 0 \tag{1.14}$$

$$\Rightarrow \quad \forall \ell = 1,\dots,n \qquad \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varphi_{k\ell}(v,w) = \sum_{k=1}^{n} \varphi_{\ell k}(z,v) \equiv 0 \tag{1.15}$$

Now, consider the part of the inner integral along γ_ℓ for $z \notin \Sigma\gamma$ near v; since $\varphi_{\ell,m}(z,w)$ extends to a locally analytic function in the neighborhood of v, the properties of the Cauchy transform immediately imply the following local identity of analytic functions

$$J_{\ell m}(z) = \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\varphi_{\ell m}(w,z)}{(w-z)^2}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} = \frac{\varphi_{\ell m}(v,v)}{z-v} + \ln_\ell(z-v)F_{\ell m}(z) + G_{\ell m}(z). \tag{1.16}$$

Here $F_{\ell m}, G_{\ell m}$ are locally analytic functions and $\ln_\ell(z-v)$ stands for the logarithm with the branch-cut extending along γ_ℓ. Now we see that the total integral over $\Sigma\gamma$ involves summing over the incident arcs at v and then (1.15) implies that the pole in (1.16) cancels out in the summation so that the integral is locally convergent in the ordinary sense (irrespectively of the boundary values of the logarithms). Having established the convergence of the integral, we now choose ϵ sufficiently small so that the various disks $\mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{(v)}$ are disjoint. We then have

$$\int_{\Sigma\gamma}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\int_{\Sigma\gamma}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2} = \underbrace{\int_{\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\int_{\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2}}_{A_\epsilon} + \tag{1.17}$$

$$+ \underbrace{\left(\int_{\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} + \int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\int_{\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\right)\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z-w)^2}}_{B_\epsilon} + \underbrace{\int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2}}_{C_\epsilon}$$

The expression A_ϵ consists only of integrations over non-intersecting arcs and thus we can apply Lemma A.1

$$A_\epsilon = -\frac{1}{2}\int_{\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\partial_w\varphi(w,z)\Big|_{w=z} \tag{1.18}$$

This term clearly admits a limit as $\epsilon = 0$ equal to A_0; a short computation gives

$$\partial_w\varphi(w,z)\Big|_{w=z} \overset{(1.6)}{=} 2\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\Xi(z)\wedge\Xi(z)\Big) + \mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Xi'(z)\wedge\Xi(z)\Big) \tag{1.19}$$

and hence

$$A_0 = -\int_{\Sigma\gamma}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\left\{\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Gamma_-^{-1}(z)\Gamma_-'(z)\Xi(z)\wedge\Xi(z)\Big) + \frac{1}{2}\mathrm{Tr}\Big(\Xi'(z)\wedge\Xi(z)\Big)\right\} \tag{1.20}$$

The remaining issue is the evaluation of B_ϵ, C_ϵ: as for B_ϵ we now show that it is identically zero. The inner integration in w and the outer integration in z have common points at $\Sigma\gamma\cap\partial\mathbb{D}_\epsilon$; let c be one of these points. The integrand in B_ϵ is actually L^1 integrable over $\Sigma\gamma_\epsilon\times(\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon)$ (and the reversed) because near the common points (on the boundary of $\mathbb{D}_\epsilon$) the behavior of the integrand is (see Fig. 4)

$$\frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z-w)^2} = \frac{C}{(z-w)} + \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{1.21}$$



Figure 4

and hence the local nature of the integral is the same as the convergent integral $\int_0^\epsilon \int_{-\epsilon}^0 \frac{\mathrm{d}x\,\mathrm{d}y}{x+y}$. Thus the interchange of order of integral is allowed by Fubini's theorem and we conclude that $B_\epsilon \equiv 0$ (using $\varphi(z,w) = -\varphi(w,z)$) for all ϵ (sufficiently small).

It remains to analyze the term C_ϵ; it is clear (due to the skew-symmetry of φ) that the only contributions to the double integral may come from (z,w) in a neighborhood of the *same* vertex $v \in \mathfrak{V}$.

Consider one of them and denote the incident arcs in $\Sigma\gamma \cap \{|z-v| < \epsilon\} = \bigcup_{\ell=1}^{n_v} \gamma_\ell^{(v)}$ by $\gamma_\ell,\ \ell = 1,\dots,n$; denote by σ_ℓ the distal endpoints of the arcs (at distance ϵ from v). We denote with $\varphi_{\ell m}^{(v)} = \varphi_{\ell m}(v,v)$ for brevity (we also omit the superscript $^{(v)}$ since we consider one vertex at a time). Then

$$\int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{(v)}} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_{\Sigma\gamma\cap\mathbb{D}_\epsilon^{(v)}} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2} = \sum_{\ell=1}^n \sum_{m=1}^n \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}(w,z)}{(z_- - w)^2} \tag{1.22}$$

The term with $\ell = m$ yields a convergent integral that is handled by Lemma A.1 and tends to zero as $\epsilon \searrow 0$ since the length of γ_ℓ is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ (and the integrand is bounded). Let us now consider the remaining terms;

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{J} &:= \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}(w,z)}{(w-z)^2} = \\ &= \underbrace{\sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}(w,z) - \varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2}}_{(\star)} + \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2}\end{aligned} \tag{1.23}$$

Each double integral in the sum marked $(\star)$ is a regularly convergent integral because of the regularization constant that we have added and subtracted; the other integral, on the contrary, is a singular integral and it depends on the order of integration. On the integral $(\star)$ we can swap order of integration and relabel $z \leftrightarrow w, \ell \leftrightarrow m$, and then use the skew symmetry $\varphi_{\ell m}(z,w) = -\varphi_{m\ell}(w,z)$, like so

$$\mathbf{J} = \sum_m \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \sum_{\ell\neq m} \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}(w,z) - \varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2} + \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2} \overset{\substack{z\leftrightarrow w\\ \ell\leftrightarrow m}}{=} \tag{1.24}$$

$$= \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{\ell m}(z,w) - \varphi_{\ell m}}{(z-w)^2} + \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2} = \tag{1.25}$$

$$\begin{aligned}&= -\mathbf{J} - \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{\ell m}}{(z-w)^2} + \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2} = \\ &= -\mathbf{J} + 2\sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \int_{\gamma_m} \frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(w-z)^2} = \\ &= -\mathbf{J} + 2\sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{2i\pi(z-\sigma_m)}\end{aligned} \tag{1.26}$$



Figure 5

Here $\sigma_m = \gamma_m \cap \mathbb{D}_\epsilon$ (Fig. 5). Solving for $\mathbf{J}$ we obtain finally:

$$\mathbf{J} = \sum_\ell \int_{\gamma_\ell} \frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi} \sum_{m\neq\ell} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{2i\pi(z-\sigma_m)} = \sum_\ell \sum_{m\neq\ell} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(2i\pi)^2} \ln_\ell \left(\frac{\sigma_\ell - \sigma_m}{v - \sigma_m}\right) \tag{1.27}$$

To compute the last expression we proceed as follows; first we observe that it is independent of v and σ_ℓ's. Indeed, differentiating we get

$$\partial_v \mathbf{J} = \sum_\ell \sum_{m\neq\ell} \frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(2i\pi)^2} \frac{1}{v-\sigma_m} \overset{(1.15)+(\varphi_{\ell\ell}=0)}{=} 0$$

$$\partial_{\sigma_j}\mathbf{J} = \sum_{m\neq j}\frac{\varphi_{mj}}{(2i\pi)^2}\frac{1}{\sigma_j-\sigma_m}+\sum_{\ell\neq j}\frac{\varphi_{j\ell}}{(2i\pi)^2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_j-\sigma_\ell}-\frac{1}{v-\sigma_j}\right)\overset{(1.15)}{=}$$
$$=\sum_{m\neq j}\frac{\varphi_{mj}}{(2i\pi)^2}\frac{1}{\sigma_j-\sigma_m}+\sum_{m\neq j}\frac{\varphi_{jm}}{(2i\pi)^2}\left(\frac{1}{\sigma_j-\sigma_m}\right)\overset{\varphi_{m\ell}=-\varphi_{\ell m}}{=}0 \tag{1.28}$$

Thus we can compute $\mathbf{J}$ by arranging σ_ℓ's as we wish; to do so, we re-write it back as a double integral

$$\mathbf{J} = \sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\varphi_{m\ell}}{(z-w)^2} =$$
$$=\sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\varphi_{m\ell}\left(1-\frac{v-c}{2(w-c)}-\frac{v-c}{2(z-c)}\right)}{(z-w)^2}+\frac{1}{2}\sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\varphi_{m\ell}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\frac{v-c}{w-c}+\frac{v-c}{z-c}}{(z-w)^2} \tag{1.29}$$

The point c is an arbitrary point not on any of the segments. The first integral is a regular convergent integral (the integrand is in L^1 near $z=w=v$) and exchanging the order of integration and then renaming the variables yields the same expression with a minus sign: hence we conclude that it is zero. We are thus left with the second term, which we now know is also independent of σ_ℓ's. To compute it more conveniently, we send all σ_ℓ's to infinity along distinct directions: the value of the expression, as we know, is independent of σ's, so that now the arcs γ_ℓ are simply pairwise distinct rays issuing from v. In the limit we obtain the following

$$\mathbf{J} = \underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\varphi_{m\ell}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\frac{v-c}{z-c}}{(z-w)^2}}_{(\dagger)}+\underbrace{\frac{1}{2}\sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\varphi_{m\ell}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\frac{v-c}{w-c}}{(z-w)^2}}_{(\heartsuit)} \tag{1.30}$$

The term (†) is zero: indeed it is

$$(\dagger)=\frac{1}{2}\sum_\ell\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\sum_{m\neq\ell}\varphi_{m\ell}\frac{\frac{v-c}{z-c}}{2i\pi(z-v)}\overset{(1.15)}{=}0. \tag{1.31}$$

In the remaining term, we write the integrand in partial fractions

$$\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\frac{v-c}{w-c}}{(w-z)^2}=\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\left(\frac{1}{w-c}-\frac{1}{w-z}\right)+\frac{c-v}{c-z}\underbrace{\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{1}{(w-z)^2}}_{=-\frac{1}{z-v}}\quad z\in\gamma_\ell \tag{1.32}$$

The first integral depends on m; to make the dependence manifest, we choose c on the right of γ_1 but to the left of γ_n (the final result is independent of this choice) and rotate the contour of integration in (1.32) clockwise to a direction between c and γ_n (denoted γ_0, see Fig. 6):

$$\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\left(\frac{1}{w-c}-\frac{1}{w-z}\right)=$$
$$=\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\int_{\gamma_0}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\left(\frac{1}{w-c}-\frac{1}{w-z}\right)-\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\begin{cases}1 & m<\ell\\ 0 & m>\ell\end{cases} \tag{1.33}$$



Figure 6

Thus, summarizing

$$\int_{\gamma_m}\frac{\mathrm{d}w}{2i\pi}\frac{\frac{v-c}{w-c}}{(w-z)^2}=\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\ln_0\left(\frac{v-z}{v-c}\right)+\frac{c-v}{(z-c)(z-v)}-\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2}\begin{cases}1 & m<\ell\\ 0 & m>\ell\end{cases} \tag{1.34}$$

The first two terms are independent of m and hence they give a zero contribution to the term ($\heartsuit$) in (1.30) because of the condition (1.15). We are thus left with

$$\mathbf{J} = -\frac{1}{2}\sum_{\ell}\sum_{m<\ell}\varphi_{m\ell}\int_{\gamma_\ell}\frac{\mathrm{d}z}{2i\pi}\frac{v-c}{(z-c)^2} = -\frac{1}{4i\pi}\sum_{\ell}\sum_{m<\ell}\varphi_{m\ell} \tag{1.35}$$

Finally, one reads off the definition of $\varphi_{m\ell}(v,v)$, using (1.13),

$$\varphi_{m\ell}(v,v) = \mathrm{Tr}\left(\Gamma_m\Xi_m\Gamma_m^{-1}\wedge\Gamma_\ell\Xi_\ell\Gamma_\ell^{-1}\right) \tag{1.36}$$

the terms in the sum appearing in (2.5). ■

References

[1] M. Bertola. The dependence on the monodromy data of the isomonodromic tau function. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 294(2):539–579, 2010.

[2] M Bertola and M Cafasso. The Transition between the Gap Probabilities from the Pearcey to the Airy Process–a Riemann-Hilbert Approach. *International Mathematics Research Notices*, doi: 10.1093/imrn/rnr066:1–50, 2011.

[3] M. Bertola and M. Cafasso. Fredholm determinants and pole-free solutions to the noncommutative Painlevé II equation. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 309(3):793–833, 2012.

[4] M. Bertola and M. Cafasso. Riemann–hilbert approach to multi-time processes: The airy and the pearcey cases. *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena*, 241(23-24):2237 – 2245, 2012. Integrable Systems in Pure and Applied Mathematics.

[5] M. Bertola and M. Cafasso. The gap probabilities of the tacnode, Pearcey and Airy point processes, their mutual relationship and evaluation. *Random Matrices: Theory and Applications*, 02(02):1350003, 2013.

[6] M. Bertola and M. Cafasso. Darboux transformations and random point processes. *IMRN*, rnu122:56, 2014.

[7] F. D. Gakhov. *Boundary value problems*. Dover Publications, Inc., New York, 1990. Translated from the Russian, Reprint of the 1966 translation.

[8] Alexander Its and Andrei Prokhorov. *Connection problem for the tau-function of the Sine-Gordon reduction of Painlevé-III equation via the Riemann-Hilbert approach*. http://arxiv.org/abs/1506.07485.

[9] Michio Jimbo, Tetsuji Miwa, and Kimio Ueno. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. I. General theory and τ-function. *Phys. D*, 2(2):306–352, 1981.

[10] Michio Jimbo and Tetsuji Miwa. Monodromy preserving deformation of linear ordinary differential equations with rational coefficients. II. *Phys. D*, 2(3):407–448, 1981.